UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,126	09/21/2001	David A. Monroe	121817.001.051	5013

67589 7590 02/28/2007

MOORE LANDREY
1609 SHOAL CREEK BLVD
AUSTIN, TX 78701.

EXAMINER
MEUCCI, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/960,126	MONROE, DAVID A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael D. Meucci	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 October 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 September 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed 18 October 2006.

2. Claims 1-33 are currently pending.

3. Prosecution is hereby reopened and abandonment is withdrawn. The application has returned to "after non-final" status. The amendments/arguments filed 24 October 2005 have been considered.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement filed 05 July 2006 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because there is no statement disclosing: (1) That each item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was first cited in any communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application not more than three months prior to the filing of the information disclosure statement; or (2) That no item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was cited in a communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, and, to the knowledge of the person signing the certification after making reasonable inquiry, no item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was known to any individual designated in § 1.56(c) more than three months prior to the filing of the information disclosure statement (see 37 CFR 1.97(e)). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date

of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 8, 11-14, 16-18, 21-22, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheikh in view of Richman.

a. With respect to claim 1, Sheikh discloses a method for collecting data from a device in a non-intrusive manner and transmitting it to a comprehensive networked system, comprising the steps of: reading the output data generated by a device (fig. 1, items 128 and 129); transmitting the output data to a system server (fig. 1, items 124,129, 128, 127, 126, 123, 120, and 100); and managing the output data via the system server (col. 4, lines 63-67). Sheikh does not disclose expressly that the data collected from a device in a non-intrusive manner could be legacy data from a legacy

device. Richman discloses that it is known that legacy devices can be incorporated into systems and that data can be obtained from them (col. 16, lines 54-56). Sheikh and Richman are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow Sheikh's system to utilize legacy devices for the client systems. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow Sheikh's system to incorporate equipment that is already owned and in place to reduce costs for the system implementation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Richman with Sheikh for the benefit of reduced costs and equipment reuse to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

b. With respect to claim 2, Sheikh further discloses the step of assigning an identifier to the output data for defining the type of device (col. 4, lines 51-52, 53).

c. With respect to claim 3, Sheikh further discloses that the identifier also identifies the location of the device (col. 4, line 53).

d. With respect to claim 4, Sheikh further discloses that the reading step comprises reading the output data on an RS232 output port of the device (col. 3, lines 36-38).

e. With respect to claim 5, Sheikh further discloses that the reading step comprises reading the output data on a serial output port of the device (col. 6, line 9).

f. With respect to claim 8, Sheikh further discloses that the data is transmitted in the transmitting step via the Ethernet (col. 6, lines 52-58).

g. With respect to claim 11, Sheikh further discloses a plurality of devices, each producing a unique output signal, each of which is transmitted to the networked system in the transmitting step (col. 4, lines 51-52).

h. With respect to claim 12, Sheikh further discloses the step of assigning a unique identifier to the output data for defining each device (col. 4, lines 51-52).

i. With respect to claim 13, Sheikh further discloses that each unique identifier also identifies the unique location of the device (col. 4, line 53).

j. With respect to claim 14, Sheikh further discloses a plurality of systems, each system including a device producing an output signal, and wherein the plurality of systems are not compatible with one another (col. 5, lines 66-67; col. 6, lines 1-6).

k. With respect to claim 16, Sheikh discloses an apparatus for collecting data from a device in a non-intrusive manner and transmitting it to a comprehensive networked system, comprising: network server (fig. 1, item 100); a device having an output port through which an output signal is transmitted (fig. 1, item 124); a transmitter for transmitting the output signal to the network server (fig. 1, item 128). Sheikh does not disclose expressly that the data collected from a device in a non-intrusive manner could be legacy data from a legacy device. Richman discloses that it is known that legacy devices can be incorporated into systems and that data can be obtained from them (col. 16, lines 54-56). Sheikh and Richman are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow Sheikh's system to utilize legacy devices for the client systems. The motivation for doing so would have

been to allow Sheikh's system to incorporate equipment that is already owned and in place to reduce costs for the system implementation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Richman with Sheikh for the benefit of reduced costs and equipment reuse to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

l. With respect to claim 17, Sheikh further discloses that the output port is a serial output port (col. 6, line 9).

m. With respect to claim 18, Sheikh further discloses that the output port is an RS232 port (col. 13, lines 36-38).

n. With respect to claim 21, Sheikh further discloses that the server is adapted for assigning an identifier to the output data for identifying the device (col. 4, lines 51-52).

o. With respect to claim 22, Sheikh further that the transmitter is the Ethernet (col. 6, lines 52-58).

p. With respect to claim 25, Sheikh further discloses a plurality of devices (fig. 1, items 122 and 124), each producing a unique output signal, each of which is transmitted to the networked system by the transmitter (col. 4, lines 51-52).

q. With respect to claim 26, Sheikh further discloses that a unique identifier is assigned to each output data for defining each device (col. 4, lines 51-52).

r. With respect to claim 27, Sheikh further discloses that each unique identifier also identifies the unique location of the device (col. 4, line 53).

s. With respect to claim 28, Sheikh further discloses a plurality of systems, each system including a device producing an output signal, and wherein the plurality of systems are not compatible with one another (col. 5, lines 66-67; col. 6, lines 1-6).

7. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klayh in view of Richman.

a. With respect to claim 32, Klayh discloses a method for capturing data, comprising: capturing device data in a multi-media system server (par. 45, lines 2-3); creating a socket (par. 102, line 4); reading the data from the socket (par. 102, lines 5-6); and storing the data in a database associated with the server (par. 45, lines 2-3; fig. 1, item 9). Klayh does not disclose expressly that the captured data could be legacy data from a legacy device. Richman discloses that it is known that legacy devices can be incorporated into systems and that data can be obtained from them (col. 16, lines 54-56). Klayh and Richman are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow Klayh's system to utilize legacy devices. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow Klayh's system to incorporate equipment that is already owned and in place to reduce costs for the system implementation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Richman with Klayh for the benefit of reduced costs and equipment reuse to obtain the invention as specified in claim 32.

8. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy in view of Richman.

a. With respect to claim 33, Roy discloses a method for managing data, comprising: receiving an alert signal at a multi-media system server (col. 22, lines 1-3); and zooming, by a camera, to a location of the alert based on the proximity of the camera to the location (col. 22, lines 8-11). Roy does not disclose expressly that the alert signal could be from a legacy device. Richman discloses that it is known that legacy devices can be incorporated into systems and that data can be obtained from them (col. 16, lines 54-56). Roy and Richman are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow Roy's system to utilize legacy devices. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow Roy's system to incorporate equipment that is already owned and in place to reduce costs for the system implementation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Richman with Roy for the benefit of reduced costs and equipment reuse to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

9. Claims 6 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheikh in view of Richman as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, and further in view of Evans.

a. With respect to claim 6, Sheikh and Richman do not disclose expressly that the device includes a processor having open database connectivity and wherein the

reading step comprises reading the output data in the database. Evans discloses that it is known that systems can support open database connectivity (col. 4, lines 9-10) and that it is possible to read data from a database (col. 5, lines 25-28). Sheikh, Richman, and Evans are analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of computer systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow Sheikh and Richman's method to include a device with open database connectivity and to allow data to be read from that database, as taught by Evans. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow Sheikh and Richman's system to have an organized system of data storage that is accessible by a server. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Evans with Sheikh and Richman for the benefit of data storage and accessibility to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

b. With respect to claim 20, Sheikh and Richman do not disclose expressly that the device includes open database connectivity and wherein the transmitter device receives the output data from the device database. Evans discloses that it is known that systems can support open database connectivity (col. 4, lines 9-10) and that it is possible to read and transmit data from a database (col. 5, lines 25-28). Sheikh, Richman, and Evans are analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow Sheikh and Richman's apparatus to include a device with open database connectivity and to allow data to be read and transmitted from that database, as taught by Evans. The motivation for doing so would

have been to allow Sheikh and Richman's system to have an organized system of data storage that is accessible by a server. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Evans with Sheikh and Richman for the benefit of data storage and accessibility to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheikh in view of Richman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brockway.

a. With respect to claim 7, Sheikh and Richman do not disclose expressly that the comprehensive networked system includes a server and wherein the device is driven by software, the method further including the initial step of loading the software in the system server and wherein the device output data is transmitted to the server and managed by the software, and wherein the reading step includes reading the output data transmitted to the server. Brockway discloses that it is known that it is possible to install driver software on a system server (col. 2, line 58) and that it is possible to transmit data to the server and for the server to read and manage that data (col. 2, lines 59-62). Sheikh, Richman, and Brockway are analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to install driver software on Sheik and Richman's system, and to allow that software to manage the flow of data to the system, as taught by Brockway. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow Sheik and Richman's system to have an organized and controlled method of data transfer between remote clients and the server. Therefore, it would have been obvious

to combine Brockway with Sheikh and Richman for the benefit of improved data transfer to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

11. Claims 9, 10, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheikh in view of Richman as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, and further in view of Hollenberg.

a. With respect to claims 9 and 24, Sheikh and Richman do not disclose expressly that the networked system includes a camera activated by an event in the camera zone, and wherein an output signal from a device in the zone of the camera will activate the camera. Hollenberg discloses that it is known that devices can be activated by signals from other nodes on a network (col. 11, lines 55-58), including cameras (col. 11, line 45). Sheikh, Richman, and Hollenberg are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to equip Sheikh and Richman's system with a camera that could be activated by a signal from another component, as taught by Hollenberg. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a remote administrator of Sheikh and Richman's system to obtain a visual image of the physical environment of the system when activated by another component, this component being an error-detection type of component. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hollenberg with Sheikh and Richman for the benefit of visual monitoring of the system to obtain the inventions as specified in claims 9 and 24.

b. With respect to claims 10 and 23, Sheikh and Richman do not disclose expressly that the networked system includes networked appliances responsive to an event, and wherein an output signal from a device will activate an appliance response. Hollenberg discloses that it is known that devices can be activated by signals from other nodes on a network (col. 11, lines 55-58). Sheikh, Richman, and Hollenberg are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to equip Sheikh and Richman's system with an appliance, such as a camera, that could be activated by a signal from another component, as taught by Hollenberg. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a remote administrator of Sheikh and Richman's system to utilize such an appliance to obtain a visual image of the physical environment of the system when activated by another component, this component being an error-detection type of component. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hollenberg with Sheikh and Richman for the benefit of visual monitoring of the system to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10 and 23.

12. Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheikh in view of Richman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hauck.

a. With respect to claim 15, Sheikh and Richman do not disclose expressly that the output signal is the printer port output signal. Hauck discloses that it is known that a printer port can be used to output data from a device (col. 9, lines 38-40). Sheikh,

Richman, and Hauck are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow Sheikh and Richman's system to utilize a printer port for an output port, as taught by Hauck. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide Sheikh and Richman's system with another means of outputting signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hauck with Sheikh and Richman for the benefit of additional output means to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

b. With respect to claim 19, Sheikh and Richman do not disclose expressly that the output port is a printer port. Hauck discloses that it is known that a printer port can be used to output data from a device (col. 9, lines 38-40). Sheikh, Richman, and Hauck are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow Sheikh and Richman's system to utilize a printer port for an output port, as taught by Hauck. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide Sheikh and Richman's system with another means of outputting signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hauck with Sheikh and Richman for the benefit of additional output means to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

13. Claims 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lotito in view of Gaul, Neill, and Richman.

With respect to claims 29 and 31, Lotito discloses a method for capturing data using a serial output port, comprising: testing an input port (col. 17, line 25); determining if a log is open (col. 40, lines 26-27); writing the data to the output port (col. 45, lines 60-61). Lotito does not disclose expressly the method of testing a socket connection to a server or writing the data to the socket or that the captured output data could be legacy output data from a legacy device. Gaul discloses that it is known that a socket's connection to a server can be tested (par. 68, lines 1-3). Neill discloses that it is known that data can be written to a socket (col. 6, line 20). Richman discloses that it is known that legacy devices can be incorporated into systems and that data can be obtained from them (col. 16, lines 54-56). Lotito, Gaul, Neill, and Richman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of electronic systems. At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize and test a socket connection on Lotito's system, as taught by Gaul. It would also have been obvious to write data to the socket, as taught by Neill. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to retrieve his or her messages via the Internet reliably. At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that Lotito's system could utilize legacy devices as taught by Richman. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow Lotito's system to incorporate equipment that is already owned and in place to reduce costs for the system implementation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gaul, Neill, and Richman with Lotito for the benefit of Internet accessibility and cost reduction to obtain the invention as specified in claims 29 and 31.

14. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hebel in view of Dean and Richman.

a. With respect to claim 30, Hebel discloses a method for capturing data using a system computer, comprising: reading a database (col. 6, lines 40-41); saving the read database in a server (col. 6, lines 42-43). Hebel does not disclose expressly the method step of checking a socket connection to a server. Hebel also does not disclose expressly that the captured data could be legacy data, that the system computer could be a legacy system computer, or that the database and server could be a legacy database and a legacy server. Dean discloses that it is known that a socket connection to a server can be checked (col. 7, lines 35,37). Richman discloses that it is known that legacy devices can be incorporated into systems and that data can be obtained from them (col. 16, lines 54-56). Hebel, Dean, and Richman are analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of computing systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to allow Hebel's system to check a socket's connection to a server, as taught by Dean. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the reliability of the system by checking the socket to ensure that it is connected to a server. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to allow Hebel's system to utilize legacy devices, as taught by Richman. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow Hebel's system to incorporate equipment that is already owned and in place to reduce costs for the system implementation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dean and Richman with Hebel for the benefit of socket reliability and reduced costs to obtain the invention as specified in claim 30.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 24 October 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

16. (A) Regarding claims 29-31, the examiner withdraws the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph for indefiniteness and acknowledges the applicant's admission that the claims contain conditional limitations.

17. (B) Regarding claims 1 and 16, the applicant contends that neither Sheikh nor Richman disclose multiple elements including the entirety of claims 1 and 16.

As to point (B), the applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. The applicant cannot recite the entire claim and then allege that the prior does not teach the limitation of the entire claim without supporting evidence and/or arguments.

18. (C) Regarding claims 29 and 31, the applicant contends that Lotito does not teach using a *legacy* port for *legacy* data.

As to point (C), the examiner points out that Gaul was relied on for teaching the *legacy* limitations of the claim. See rejection above for details. The applicant provides no additional support for this argument.

19. (D) Regarding claims 29 and 31, the applicant contends that Lotito does not determine if a log is open and if the log is open, writing legacy data to the log. Once again, Lotito is not relied upon for teaching *legacy* equipment or data (see point (C) above). Determining if a log is open is inherent in Lotito (see lines 26-27 of column 40 describing writing to a log file). It is inherent that this determination is made because data cannot be written to a file without first opening the file, and opening a file requires checking to see if the file is already open. As such, the rejection remains proper and is maintained by the examiner.

20. (E) Regarding claims 29 and 31, the applicant contends that Lotito does not write to a legacy output port. Again, the examiner points to (C) above.

21. (F) Regarding claims 29 and 31, the applicant contends that Lotito does not write legacy data to a socket. Again, the examiner points to (C) above.

22. (G) Regarding claim 30, the applicant contends that Hebel does not describe capturing legacy data, using a legacy system, or capturing legacy data by using a legacy system.

As to point (G), the examiner points out that Gaul was relied on for teaching the *legacy* limitations of the claim. See rejection above for details. The applicant provides no additional support for this argument.

23. (H) Regarding claims 32-33, the applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

O'Brien et al. (U.S. 6,470,384 B1) discloses logging network events in legacy computing environments.

Guheen et al. (U.S. 6,473,794 B1) discloses monitoring events and connectivity to legacy databases and applications.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (571) 272-3892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for this Group is 571-273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER